

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of Claims**

After the above amendments, claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1 and 7 are independent.

The Examiner has objected to claim 7 based on informalities. Specifically, the Examiner has suggested replacing “on” in line 7 of the claim with --out--. The Examiner’s thorough review of the claims is appreciated. In the present response, claim 7 has been amended to address the Examiner’s objection by amending the limitation to state that the first protrusion is “moved out of the thread of said lead screw.” This language, now consistent with claim 1, is believed to make clear Applicants’ invention and overcome the objection. However, if the amended language is still found objectionable, Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned for resolution.

**II. Amendments to the Specification**

The specification has been amended to correct typographical and other minor errors. Specifically, typographical errors have been amended in paragraphs [0039] and [0042]. Also, a minor numbering error has corrected in paragraph [0043] by amending “136” to read --135-- which correlates with the drawings. No new matter has been introduced by the above amendments.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by US 5,889,638 to Kawabasa et al. (hereinafter “Kawabasa”)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Kawabasa. However, because Kawabasa does not disclose, teach or suggest all limitations of the instant claims, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants’ claimed invention provides an apparatus comprising unique combinations of features, including for example, a slider having a first protrusion and a second protrusion which are in a groove of a lead screw, as recited in independent claims 1 and 7. Applicants respectfully submit that Kawabasa, neither explicitly nor implicitly, discloses, teaches or suggests such features.

In the outstanding rejection, the Examiner asserts that the claimed first protrusion reads on element 36 of Kawabasa while the claimed second protrusion reads on element 39d of Kawabasa. However, what is notably missing from the rejection is any assertion that Kawabasa discloses elements 36 and 39d as part of a slider; that Kawabasa discloses a *slider* having a first and second protrusion as required by the present claims. Indeed, the rejection fails to list any element of Kawabasa that anticipates the “slider” of claims 1 and 7 and for that reason alone must be withdrawn.

Kawabasa discloses that element 36 is an “engaging projection” (col. 6, line 25) and that element 39d is “a projection” (col. 7, line 21). However, even if it is assumed, *arguendo*, that the “engaging projection” 36 of Kawabasa may be considered a first protrusion and the “projection” 39d of Kawabasa may be considered a second protrusion, that does not anticipate claims 1 and 7 which comprise a *slider* having a first and second protrusion. In contradistinction to the instant invention, Kawabasa discloses that engaging projection 36 “is provided on the topside of the lead screw *supporting part 9b*” (col. 6, lines 25-27). This is illustrated by Kawabasa in figure 11B wherein projection 36 is shown atop supporting part 9b. Also in contradistinction, Kawabasa discloses that projection 39d “projects from the bottom of *restraining part 39c*” (col. 7, lines 21-22). This is illustrated in figure 14B wherein projection 39d is shown projecting from restraining part 39C. Kawabasa may be considered to disclose a *supporting part* having a projection and a *restraining part* having a projection, but nowhere does Kawabasa disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus comprising a *slider* having a first and second protrusion. And again, the asserted rejection has not explained which element of Kawabasa anticipates the claimed slider having a first and second protrusion. In all, claims 1 and 7, and claims 2-6 and 8-12 based on their dependency are not anticipated as Kawabasa does not teach all limitations of the instant claims.

Appl. No. 10/736,534  
Amdt. dated June 16, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2006

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Christian C. Michel  
Reg. No. 46,300  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: June 16, 2006

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680  
Main: (202) 659-9076  
Direct: (202)530-7381